

evictions and express solidarity with the Rapa Nui nation, especially in light of President Obama's planned visit to Chile next month and Assistant Secretary Valenzuela's recent testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday. I sincerely hope that even our international community will build pressure on President Pinera and the Government of Chile. Let's treat these poor people with justice and give them an opportunity to live in peace in this area. I ask that the good people of America make this appeal and that the Government of Chile be responsive to this request.

#### REGARDING THE REPUBLICAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this continuing resolution, a continuing resolution that I call the silly, the dangerous and the hypocritical. Budgets are more than just numbers. They are a statement of our values as a Nation.

As a Congress, we are faced with several serious challenges: growing our economy, putting people back to work, investing in the future, reducing the deficit, and ensuring the most vulnerable in our society are protected. Judging on that criteria alone, this CR doesn't pass the laugh test.

It would cut 300,000 private sector transportation jobs, ensuring our construction workers are receiving unemployment checks instead of paychecks. It would stifle our competition. It would stifle competitiveness by making Pell Grants less accessible to students and families. And it would run roughshod over women, children and the environment. With such an extreme proposal, I assume my good friends on the Republican side would be coming forward with ideas to improve it. But what we've gotten this week is a combination of the silly, the dangerous, and the hypocritical.

In the silly department, we have an amendment preventing funds from being used to repair the White House. Now ironically right now, going on in the Rayburn Building, are remodeling of hearing rooms that I guess the chairmen of these committees have found no need to halt. How much money is being spent there?

Or how about the amendment preventing funds from being used for President Obama's teleprompter. Oh, right. We're going to cut \$3,000 from the budget. That's really going to help us. I would expect this sort of hyperpartisanship on cable TV, but not in a budget debate.

Under dangerous, we have: several provisions gutting environmental protection, rolling back EPA regulations on clean air and clean water, and reducing our investment in clean energy, making America even more dependent on foreign oil. How many more solar

panels do we want manufactured in China?

How about the amendment undermining a third party testing requirement at the Consumer Product Safety Commission? Great. So let's have Chinese companies pour in more tainted toys, more lead- and cadmium-filled toys for our kids.

How about the reduction in funding for our first responders, meaning there will be less cops and less firefighters in every single neighborhood in this country?

Or how about the amendment preventing funding for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, meaning big banks can call the shots again? Have we learned nothing from the financial meltdown over the last 3 years?

Or how about the unprecedented attack on women's reproductive health which will result in more unplanned pregnancies and more abortions; not less.

And finally, the category my colleagues on the Republican side seem to relish the most—hypocritical. The party that ran on jobs has authored a budget that would increase the unemployment rolls. Asked about likely job losses in the CR, Speaker BOEHNER said, "Well, so be it." It's like Marie Antoinette saying, "Let them eat cake."

The party that ran on cutting spending didn't take a scalpel to the defense budget; they took a toothpick. In fact, there's another \$2.2 billion in the budget for the V-22 Osprey, which is basically obsolete; \$495 million for nine Joint Strike Fighters; and \$450 for a second engine that the military defense budget doesn't want.

And the party that ran on fiscal responsibility has offered a budget that will balloon the deficit by continuing tax cuts for the millionaires and billionaires that don't need them.

I agree with President Obama, that we must out-innovate, out-educate and out-build the rest of the world. While not perfect, the budget he released this week will take an important step in that direction. As for the silly, the dangerous and the hypocritical CR we are considering today, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Budgeting is a serious process, and what we're doing this week is unserious at least.

#### IMPARTIALITY AND THE SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on a day that we're talking about the continuing resolution, I want to talk about a body that may someday be judging the continuing resolution—the Supreme Court. There is perhaps nothing more important to the preservation of our democracy than the continued guaranteed impartiality of our

Supreme Court. It's a uniquely American institution; it's been given enormous power to invalidate American laws; and it needs to be dispensed with complete blind justice, blind to outside influence.

However, this Nation's confidence in the blind justice of the Supreme Court has been badly shaken recently by a series of revelations regarding possible conflicts of interest by Justice Scalia and Justice Thomas in the Citizens United case. This landmark 5-4 decision overturned restrictions on corporate funding in elections that had been in place since 1947, and immediately thereafter, millions and millions of dollars in shadowy special interest group donations flowed into American campaigns. Two of the main benefactors of these groups were Charles and David Koch, billionaire brothers who operate a Kansas-based energy business. They spent about \$2.6 billion that we know about in the 2010 election cycle and likely a lot more in anonymous donations.

In addition to funding these outside groups, they also organize a lot of conferences in which they gather people of like mind to discuss their radical views and plot strategies to benefit their interests. Now if I were to ask somebody on a main street in my district if they would be comfortable with a Supreme Court justice attending a conference like this, having their plane flight and the hotel all paid for by the special interests, I know what their answer would be. They'd say, no way. Yet Justice Scalia and Justice Thomas did just that and they thought it was just fine. They didn't recuse themselves from the Citizens United decision at all.

But here's the real problem. This could be just an isolated problem to the Citizens United case. Or it could be much more widespread, with justices conflicted on several fronts, refusing to disclose their conflicts or recuse themselves when they have actual conflicts of interest. But we have no idea, because right now there is no law requiring Supreme Court justices to disclose their conflicts of interest as is required of all other Federal justices.

□ 1120

I don't believe we should be meddling in the day-to-day business of the Supreme Court. I get why there is great wisdom in separating legislative and judicial functions. But there's no undue burden in just requiring sunlight on Supreme Court proceedings.

So when we return to Washington after the recess, I will be introducing legislation to do just that, to implement a few reasonable reforms to add greater transparency and disclosure requirements on the Supreme Court. I hope my colleagues will join me.

My legislation will apply the Judicial Conference's Code of Conduct to the Supreme Court, which now applies to all other Federal judges. It will require the Justices to simply publicly disclose why they've recused themselves from a